



FINAL MEETING SUMMARY GENERAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Thursday, October 30, 2014

11:30 AM – 1:30 PM

Meeting Hosted By: Darcie White, Clarion Associates
Kristin Cisowski, Clarion Associates

General Plan Review Committee Members Present:

- Jim Liesen
- Dean Barlow
- Nello Ruscitti
- Laura Smith
- Dan Keyes

General Plan Review Committee Members Absent:

- Doug Traub
- Donna Brister
- Don Bergen
- Mike Eigenbrodt
- Dick Gilbert
- Donna Best-Carlton
- Mark Talley
- Dorothy McMaster
- Gerald Henkels

Staff Present:

- Stuart Schmeling, Senior Planner
- Diane Libby, Management Specialist

Darcie White of Clarion Associates welcomed the Committee to their second meeting. She stated that what is in front of them for discussion today, is two-thirds of the General Plan document. They are still working on Land Use, Growth Management, and Economics sections, those are yet to come. To summarize comments from the earlier meeting and the online survey, what they heard was that

fundamentally, the plan isn't broken, but there are a lot of opportunities for refinement. Beginning with the packet provided to the Committee, Darcie walked through each section for comments.

Vision Statement

Darcie stated that they tried to make it more of a forward statement, rather than a passive statement. The Committee responded favorably, all were pleased with the refinements made in this section.

Housing & Neighborhoods

Darcie stated that this section incorporates both the housing element as well as the neighborhood preservation and revitalization element. We have expanded it to provide more guidance.

Committee summarized comments/concerns (not limited to):

- Not in favor of mixed use by the lake front and downtown area. In 2002 the general public wanted commercial zoning at the lake front
- Concern that too much condo type activity will not draw visitors to the bridge area
- Circulation access to open space should incorporate the school district to maximize available resources
- Development of trails access, look at outside funding sources both federal and state
- Create a way to limit or change the percent densities allowed at the lake front
- Suggestion made to create an on-line survey regarding the mixed use vs. commercial use in the lake front and downtown area
- Continue to encourage IGA's with the school district
- Draft language encourages "neighborhood identity"; our community is 85% infilled, how do you do that?
- Information from the Fields Needs Assessment will be forthcoming and should provide guidance
- No central location for large regional ball field events
- How do our demographics regarding park space compare to cities of similar size

Darcie responded to several of the above comments with the following information:

- Add to draft language the coordination with other agencies, including the school district to maximize available resources
- Clarion will prepare preliminary questions for an on-line survey regarding the lake front and downtown areas regarding mixed use vs. commercial use
- We heard you loud and clear, that you do not want to encourage "complete neighborhoods", the language regarding neighborhood identity would be applicable to a future planned development, if the opportunity were to arise
- The MPO study regarding circulation will be happening on a parallel track to the General Plan update. We will modify goals and policies in this section based on the outcome of that process
- Some of the resources for open space and recreation available to us included the 2006 Trails Plan and the 2008 Facilities Plan
- Currently, total park space is 1,214 acres including the Sara Park addition

Public Facilities & Services

Darcie stated that this section deals with Fire, Police, Public Buildings, and cost of development.

Committee summarized comments/concerns (not limited to):

- The statement to development telecommunications master plan needs more definition of the objectives

- Include opportunities for wireless capability
- Wireless capability available to our visitors (app on your phone)
- Prepare to provide supporting infrastructure for the technology advancements
- Concern about water supply and usage
- Concern about emergency response time verification
- One comment in favor of impact fees; has proven useful in other communities
- One comment not in favor of impact fees; controversial in this community
- Investigate what CIP projects Council is working on during the January retreat

Darcie provided the following additional clarifications:

- Clarion is working with Fire to verify the emergency response times
- Water use will be included in the Growth Management section
- The plan outlines a series of financing options. No recommendation of one vs. the other but a menu of options

Community Safety

Darcie began discussion on the topic by stating that this is a new element regarding hazard mitigation and resiliency, not Police and Fire. The City has been working with others in the region and some ideas are already being executed. This is something to build on.

Summarized Comments From the Audience

Resident comments included suggestions regarding salvaging water runoff. Create a central water reservoir that could capture water from the flood control channels. Consider transport of draining pool water to the same reservoir to be used for irrigation purposes such as Sara Park area. There are a lot of pools in Lake Havasu City and when they drain, they are drained into the street. We could capture that water for reuse.

Next Steps

Darcie stated that Chapter 11 is the action plan. We have talked about some specific recommendations from you based on our conversation today, but are there other ideas that we should put on the table based on these policies? Are there recommended actions you want to bring forward?

The Committee began a detailed discussion regarding the process of making a change to the General Plan. Some of the key points identified are as follows:

- Some in favor of making it less restrictive to approve a change to the General Plan
- Some in favor of making it more restrictive to approve a change to the General Plan
- Inconsistencies in the use and definition of a major or minor amendment

Following the discussion, Darcie added the following comments:

- Moving forward the definitions needs to be clearly identified in both the code and the plan
- Clarion will bring the definitions back to this group for their review
- The assumption is the Plan has to provide some flexibility, but the questions is how much and to make that goal clear
- Clarion will confirm if state law mandates only one major amendment can be approved per year

Meeting concluded at 1:30 p.m.